REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-7, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21-24, 26, 27, and 30-33 are currently pending. Claims 8, 9, 11-14, and 34 have been canceled by the present amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 1-7, 21-24, 26, 27, and 30-33 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,593,955 B1 to Falcon (hereinafter "the '955 patent") in view of Japanese Patent No. JP 07321781 A to Yoshino (hereinafter "the '781 patent"); Claims 11 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the '955 patent in view of Japanese Patent No. JP 405068241 A to Fujino et al. (hereinafter "the '241 patent"); and Claims 8, 9, 12-16, 18, and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by the '955 patent.

Claim 1 is directed to a method of processing a video image that includes an object of interest, comprising: (1) capturing a sequence of images having a first resolution, in which the object of interest occupies a fraction of plural images of the sequence of captured images; (2) tracking the object of interest by selecting and extracting a region of each of the plural images that includes the object of interest; and (3) coding the extracted region of each of the plural images, wherein *the extracted region of each of the plural images has a second resolution, smaller than the first resolution, corresponding to a display format of a receiving device.*

Regarding the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Office Action asserts that the '955 patent discloses everything in Claim 1 with the exception of the extracted region of each of the plural images having a second resolution, smaller than the first resolution, corresponding to a display format of a receiving device, and relies on the '781 patent to remedy that deficiency.

The '955 patent is directed to a video telephony system in which images containing a person's head or face are extracted. Further, the '955 patent discloses that the image data surrounding the person's head is replaced with "monotonous data" for transmission to the other end of a videophone link. However, as admitted in the Office Action, the '955 patent fails to disclose coding an extracted region of each of the plural images, wherein *the extracted region of each of the plural images has a second resolution, smaller than a first resolution, corresponding to a display format of a receiving device*, as recited in Claim 1.

The '781 patent is directed to a communication system in which an entire document is converted to have a resolution matching the resolution of a receiving terminal when the receiving terminal equipment does not have the same application program as the sending terminal. However, Applicants respectfully submit that the '781 patent fails to disclose a method of processing a video image in which a region is extracted from a captured image such that *the extracted region has a second resolution, smaller than the first resolution, corresponding to a display format of a receiving device*. Rather, the '781 patent discloses a system in which an entire document is converted to match the resolution of a receiving terminal.

Thus, no matter how the teachings of the '955 and '781 patents are combined, the combination does not teach or suggest coding an extracted region of each of plural images, wherein *the extracted region of each of the plural images has a second resolution, smaller than a first resolution of the captured images, corresponding to a display format of a receiving device*, as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and that the rejection of Claim 1 (and all associated dependent claims) should be withdrawn.

Independent Claims 21-24 recite limitations analogous to the limitations recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, for the reasons stated above for the patentability of Claim 1,

Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and that the rejection of Claims 21-24 (and all associated dependent claims) should be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 8, 9, 12-14, and 34 as anticipated by the '955 patent are rendered moot by the present cancellation of those claims.

Claim 15 is directed to a method of processing a captured video image including an object of interest, comprising: (1) selecting a region of the captured image including the object of interest in which the selected region is greater than an area occupied by the object of interest *by a predetermined degree,* and the selected region has a first size; (2) scaling the selected region to a predetermined second size; and (3) coding the selected region.

As discussed above, the '955 patent is directed to a video telephony system in which a subject's head is centered within a viewport within a video image, such that the subject's head is always centered regardless of the movement of the subject within the field of view of the source camera. Further, the '955 patent discloses that the viewport is of a fixed size, for example, 240 x 280 pixels.[1] However, Applicants respectfully submit that the '955 patent fails to disclose (1) that a selected region is greater than an area occupied by the object of interest by a *predetermined degree;* and (2) scaling the selected region to a predetermined second size, as recited in Claim 15. Rather, the '955 patent does not address the situation in which the size of the object of interest increases, e.g., when the person moves closer to or away from the camera. Rather, the '955 patent merely discloses tracking the center of the person's face by following it within the field of the image. Further, the '955 patent does not disclose scaling the selected region to a predetermined second size. Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the '955 patent would have no reason to scale since the selected region is always the same size. Accordingly, for the above reasons, Applicants respectfully

[1] See column 5, line 44 of the '955 patent.

traverse the rejection of Claim 15 (and dependent Claims 16 and 18) as anticipated by the '955 patent.

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is rendered moot by the present cancellation of that claim.

Further, regarding the rejection of Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, Applicants respectfully submit that the '241 patent fails to remedy the deficiencies of the '955 patent, as discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established and that the rejection of dependent Claim 19 should be withdrawn.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 1, 15, and 21-24 (and all associated dependent claims) patentably define over any proper combination of the '955, '781, and '241 patents.

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussion, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

Kurt M. Berger

Gregory J. Maier
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 25,599
Kurt M. Berger, Ph.D.
Registration No. 51,461

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 08/03)
KMB/rac

I:\ATTY\KMB\200'S\200801US\200801US-AM.DOC